

The New Student

Vol. 5, No. 18 //

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1925

Price 5 Cents

OVERWORKED

SENIORS HAVEN'T TIME

Students Deplore the Undue Demands of Extra Activities Upon Time of Leaders

Fifteen representative campus leaders, University of Syracuse, were approached by a *Daily Orange* heeler for opinions on a number of the best known books of the moment. Out of the fifteen, fourteen regretted that they had not time to read the books, the fifteenth had read one of them. "How many of our educational centers can boast of a higher percentage?", reflects the *Orange*.

Do our student leaders prefer to remain unread, or are they too busy turning the wheels of campus machinery to loaf and invite their souls? Whatever the reason in this particular case, undergraduates elsewhere decry the multitude of organizations, cancerous growths on the student body.

For instance, Roland W. Hess in the Connecticut Wesleyan *Cardinal*:

"For Heaven's sake give us air! Give us a chance to breathe in this community of ours. . . . We have plenty of intellectual atmosphere . . . few ever have time to sample a lungful.

Picture follows: the Overworked Senior. At a time when classes are least pressing responsibilities are heaped up: fraternity administration, sports, clubs, societies, presidencies, chairmanships. . . . Picture him settling down to that neglected book—the bell rings, a voice announces a meeting of the Poo Poo Assn., or it is Professor Push drumming up attendance for the Esperanto Club. . . . Sobs the senior "I have everything I could possibly desire, except an education."

Specific suggestions follow:

(a) Junk all "dummy" extra curricular clubs.

(b) Cut down on number of intramural and inter-fraternity activities.

(c) Prove presence of mentality by using wisely the salvaged time.

Historic cycle of extra curricular clubs: ". . . comparatively recent addition to our collection of activities. Founded by a group of men with real interest . . . most of them performed a real service. . . . Signs of decadence began to be apparent The clubs adopted a variety of snappy keys and insignia, and membership in the club was added to the list of much sought after *Olla Pod* points.

Social forces do make joiners of us all. The student "naturally wishes to be respected by his fellows, and to gain their respect he feels he must squeeze into every possible activity . . . he thinks he is helping to keep alive the traditions of Wesleyan. And, too, if he joins an extra-curriculum club he thinks—'now that the professor sees that I'm interested in this course, I should get along fairly well'. . . . When a freshman enters college, the first book that is slipped into his hand is the *Olla Pod*.

(Continued on page 4, col. 1)

Students and Labor

Something must be done, writes Jerome Davis of the Yale Divinity School in the December *Century*, to increase the interest of the college body in the live problems of the day . . . to make the intellectual campus as real as the world of outside activities."

Northwestern University students have found a way to enliven their curriculum by talk fests with wobblies, hoboes, migratory workers from the wheatfields of the west and the ore boats of the Great Lakes. On Northwestern night at the Hoboe College, West Washington street, Chicago, they crowd into the one room Hobo College, voice their opinions and listen to the philosophy, the varied experiences of the migratory laborers.

At the last meeting erime was the sub-

(Continued on page 3, col. 1)

SPECULATIONS

On The Ideal College

Wesleyan Undergraduate Parley Stirs Up Much Discussion of Educational Problems

Fifty delegates from neighboring colleges, several hundred Wesleyan students, a sprinkling of professors, heard Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn, ex-president of Amherst, deliver the opening speech of the Undergraduate Parley on Education at Connecticut Wesleyan College, December 4. Dr. Meiklejohn described the students and professors of his College of the Future.

In this mythical college there will be no lecture system. "I for one am anxious to see the whole lecture system in college abolished . . . result of the system is that the graduate of the American college does not read books. . . . Reading is made a secondary thing in the college to lectures. . . . We are not learning to go to literature and live in it. . . . How American students love to be told what to think. . . . They act as infants in intellectual matters."

"A young man should really come to college to learn for himself. This life of ours needs to be thought about and each of us must have some responsibility of his own."

Dr. Meiklejohn proposes that students be unchained from text books written by the third rate minds, turned loose in the literature of the "great minds."

The faculty will not be in the position of imparting a body of truth already arrived at. "The faculty of the College of Tomorrow is trying to think. . . . Students are too. By association the students learn." The ideal relation of student and professor resembles the relation of master and apprentice.

Dr. Meiklejohn insisted on the need for a Guild of American Scholars, a group of learned men interested in directing the liberal education of the country, in deciding what must be taught. At present scholars are drifting this way and that, "never car-

(Continued on page 5, col. 3)

FOOTBALL

"IT IS OVEREMPHASIZED"

Concerted Move to Lessen Influence of Intercollegiate Football on College Life

Scarcely had the moleskins, jerseys and headgears been cleaned of their mud and packed away; and the basket ball candidates trotted out on hundreds of gym floors, when there began a devastating broadside against "The Evil That is Football." It commenced at Harvard.

Never before, exclaimed *The Crimson* "has football as a spectacle been so popular. Never has the general public been so insatiable. Never have gate receipts mounted so high. Never have the colleges posed before the public in a role so strikingly false. . . . College football has now reached the point where many persons worship it as the very acme of college purpose, as the sole standard of the merit of the colleges. . . . From the very magnitude of the evil has sprung a reaction. Numerous indications show that in many colleges many students—both players and non-players—are renouncing the foolish idolatry of the game, and no longer worship in abject humility before the jealous god of football. . . . Representing this point of view *The Crimson* advocates a return to reason."

The Crimson then proposed a plan which included elimination of pre-season practice, a series of class games during the forepart of the season culminating in three or four intercollegiate games. The reforms are not to be carried out immediately and are to be worked out in conjunction with other colleges.

While not united on details, the undergraduate dailies of Yale, Princeton and Dartmouth! diately agreed that something radical should be done to combat the present ~~over~~ emphasis on the college game.

Parley Hits Overemphasis

Overshadowing *The Crimson's* program is the even more radical action taken by the delegates from nine colleges at the Wesleyan Parley on December 6. Led by Art Howe, Yale '12, all-American full-back, the conference almost unanimously decided that football has expanded to a Roman holiday for the pleasure of the spectacle loving public and sentimental "old grads," that players get no pleasure out of the game, that football overemphasis has warped the purpose of the colleges. The following resolution was then proposed:

"This parley was called for undergraduate consideration of how the purpose of the American college can best be furthered, granted that the purpose is primarily the training of the mind.

"Very subordinate to this purpose is athletics. All intercollegiate athletics were incidental to their origin and should have remained so in their growth. We believe in them; because they encourage friendship

(Continued on Page 4, Col. 3)

The New Student

Editor DOUGLAS P. HASKELL
 News Editor NORMAN STUDER
 Associate Editor GEORGE D. PRATT, Jr.
 Business Manager BEATRICE COHEN
 Circulation Manager WILLIAM W. SCOTT

Published by THE NEW STUDENT, 2929 Broadway, New York, every week during the college year. Subscription for 1 year \$1.50 (35 weekly numbers and 8 special monthly sections)—single copies 5c. Entered as second-class matter April 20, 1922, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. 5, No. 10

December 16, 1925

"THE NEW STUDENT Invites the Student to Participate in His Own Education."

—James Harvey Robinson

WHERE WE STAND

HERE, in answer to the challenge of some student papers quoted on page 6, is a brief definition of our stand on military training in the college.

The Premise: We are in college to ask the puzzling questions about the bases of all things that active professional people have no time to think about. A four years' truce has been signed with the active world that we may get as deep and broad a view of literally everything as we can possibly cram into the time. We are not in college for training to act, as merchants or lawyers or financiers or doctors or engineers: that's the job of the university.

The relation of compulsory drill to that premise: Compulsory drill chokes off education doubly. It prevents the question-asking attitude, since its watchword is obedience without flicker of a doubt. And it violates the truce with the world of action by requiring exactly the kind of professional training the college does *not* exist to give. (By college we also mean the undergraduate schools of universities.)

The burden of proof is on the military to show why such an educational anomaly should exist. If breadwinning, doctoring, engineering and law can afford to wait four years for a sensible course in fundamentals to develop knowledge and independent judgment in their future practitioners, why this infernal itch of haste in the soldiering?

BUT not only does the military take the freshman raw, before he has a decent chance to develop any sort of fundamental judgment: it also fills him up with bunk and bribes to his vanity and intelligence. There's money to be earned, there are ponies to be ridden, feminine sponsors to be adored, parades in which to win distinguished ranking, chances to be a Big Man in a hundred ways. All of these will be swept off the moment any war may come; they are not at all a part of soldiering, but only bribes. But they do get the green ones into the system.

That's what makes the manuals such good jokes. The bloody talk of them fits so funnily with the parades! The picnic! The ponies and the pay! Distinguished rating! Honorary fraternities!

IF PATRIOTIC students of mature judgment want to train for the profession of soldiering, with their eyes open as to what a mess war is, we have no opposition to offer. But to catch them young, under over-glamorous advertising or by compulsion,

and oblige them to spend time in specific training for a job whose implications they do not understand, is wrong, and we oppose it.

That is the issue of the R. O. T. C. The issue of war and preparedness is another one, where personal convictions vary and whereupon *The New Student* would not venture to become dogmatic.

RELIEF FOR COLLEGE FOOTBALL

THE 70,000 who went to see Red Grange in simon-pure professional football at the Polo Grounds in New York may easily have been an instrument in the beginning of a thorough football revolution. Who knows? At any rate the whole ground has shifted; we stand before a question absolutely different from that we faced last Fall.

Football in college has become whatever it is, because of the public demand for the college game. Suppose that the demand should shift? What then? Grange said his present professional team-mates were better players than the younger, less experienced college men: these were post-graduates. The sport writers seemed to believe it. And skill, skill and skill alone is what the football public wants. Why not? Will Rogers said it for them. Spirit? Amateur ranking? Piffle. These exist in amateur theatricals, yet the public follows the paid performers; spirit and loyalty are in college baseball, yet professionals get the call. In short, the College, with its red tape, its demand for scholarship, its insistence that ideally, at least, the college game is an amateur sport pursued by gentlemen in their leisure: it's nothing but a burden on the Game.

Where educators had been pointing out that the College was staggering under the load of football, the public now declares that it is really football that is slow because it has to drag along the College! Separate them! Free them! Give the game a chance! And damn the College!

Thus suddenly the fans have found their hidden interests. Moreover, the college game has never been for the general public, anyway. Who gets the tickets, but the undergraduates and alumni? All the rest have to squeeze in by paying exorbitant prices to the scalpers. Professional games are cheap and open. Will the fans prefer them? Look and see. 70,000 attendance at the first one: bigger than any world series crowd!

WHILE Red Grange as hero has suddenly crystallized these hidden yearnings of the Sidewalks of New York, let's see what has been happening in the colleges.

In two years the situation has entirely shifted. Formerly the protest against the manifest professionalism of the College game was carried on by snipers, radicals, a few cautious presidents, and Mr. Van Loon. Now we find the heavy opposition led by the *Harvard Crimson*, with *Yale News*, *Princetonian*, the *Dartmouth* and a dozen other official undergraduate newspapers sympathizing in varying degree but all on the same side. Stadium building has reached a peak. The first reaction has set in. Football in College is overemphasized beyond the shadow of a doubt. What shall be done?

EVEN last September the chances for a curbing into sensible proportions of the College game seemed slight enough. They all broke against the stadium, and what

the stadium symbolizes. A stadium is an economic fact, concrete and of huge size. It means that bonds must be retired; the money simply must be earned, that's all. And inevitably you have to enter competition to attract the crowds: pay an expensive coach, get secret concessions made in scholarship, pay scouts, tutors; get jobs for candidates, provide summer training and hiding camps, secure fancy jobs in bond-selling houses for at least a year or two for your football graduates, to impress the high school boys. But supposing now there is a chance to get rid of the stadium to a city team? Or, barring that, suppose the crowds gradually begin to go to the city stadiums and leave the college one empty? And that the sport writers divide their attention, quit blowing up the College balloon so full? The College game may then willy-nilly have to become again what it always should have been: an amateur, undergraduate affair for leisure time, a concern of none but the students.

Certainly the plans hitherto proposed to bring about this end cannot succeed in doing anything worth mentioning unless professional football will assist in turning the huge tide. Consider the proposals made at Wesleyan, Conn., last week end.—Limit the number of games. Play only your neighbors. Cut out the publicity-roaring intersectionals and the all-American teams. Chase the coach off the field, put the game into the hands of the student captain.—Of what use, if money still has to be earned for the stadium, if football continues to be the drawing card for both money and boys, if the press still roars for bigger and better to report? If the Chamber of Commerce still needs trade brought to the town?

BUT now the College has its chance. Let it encourage professional sport in every way; rent the stadium to it, turn the sport writers to it, sing its praise, help sell it to the Chamber of Commerce as the superior article, and perhaps eventually sell the stadium to it outright. Let the Wesleyan program meanwhile by all means be carried on. The trouble had always been that the desires of the sporting public and the ad-depated graduates could not be destroyed. Now perhaps they can be *diverted*.

We doubt whether many colleges will soon be ready to follow their obvious duty in this matter. Idiotic as the disproportion between football and the true purposes of college is, the game has become bound up with every sort of gigantism dear to the heart of administrations. It provides an easier lure for coin and kinds than appreciation for subtler things; it helps you grow. May we not eventually see the colleges *fighting* for their kind of football in an economic battle? Perhaps the "hoi poloi" will soon be going to the city games, while the addle-pated aristocracy of alumni will attend more tony college games and join a ballyhoo for them. . . .

The New Student

2929 Broadway New York City

Enclosed is \$ to pay for subscription

to THE NEW STUDENT for

beginning, to be sent to

Name

(Please print)

Address to send NEW STUDENT

Permanent address

Subscription \$1.50 a year;

\$2.00 in Canada and foreign countries.

WIND-MILL

The *Windmill* looks forward with great anticipation to Volume 1, No. 1, of *The New Masses* which a prospectus announces is forthcoming. He believes that there is a distinct place in America for a new magazine of arts and letters with the following program:

"There are the thousands of enlightened workmen in the American labor movement. There are young people growing up in the colleges and elsewhere. There are the thousands of intellectuals everywhere who were not spiritually shell-shocked by the war. They all feel the inadequacy of dead-endism and cynicism as a life philosophy. They are not impressed with the cream-puff and bootleg of Michael Arlenism. They want something creative to live by: satire that is not a cheap gesture but a constructive criticism of society; art that builds toward a new world. They want a magazine that will lead them somewhere as did the old *Masses*. There is no such magazine in America today, and it is as necessary to create one as to produce wheat and steel. This magazine will inherit the gay and gallant adventurousness of the old *Masses*, which is why we are calling it the *New Masses*. But we shall not copy the older periodical. Our sympathy and our allegiance will be unqualifiedly with the international labor movement; but we shall have no connection with any political party, and shall be responsible to no special propaganda. Neither are we wedded to any limited aesthetic cult. We shall seek for new forms, new themes, new artists, new laughs and indignations. This is the kind of magazine we want to create. . . ."

Most of the present undergraduate generation were trotting about in knee pants and short dresses when the old *Masses* first jolted a complacent and unsophisticated America. So they are likely to be unacquainted with the magazine whose brief life, 1913 to 1918, registered a nation's coming-of-age. This was a time of great enthusiasms, and great hopes, when creative writers were first beginning to view our national life realistically: The young group of *Masses* contributors was composed of men now middle-aged — Witter Bynner, Sherwood Anderson, Carl Sandberg, Max Eastman, Floyd Dell and others. Will it be possible to revive the spirit of those dead days? If so *The Windmill* is all for it.

SOCIAL QUESTIONS

STUDENTS AND LABOR

(Continued from page 1, col. 2)

ject for discussion. Men who had served jail sentences told why they had been arrested, what the penalty had been and the treatment they had received while in custody.

Students who enter the industrial world often arouse the antagonism of organized labor. At the University of Denver there has long been enmity between the local Window Cleaners Union and a student organization of window cleaners. The union men complained because they were heads of families and could not meet the student

wage scale. Finally the matter was arbitrated. Now the students have agreed to work for union wages and hours.

In a speech at Amherst some time ago President Hopkins of Dartmouth observed that when he was in industrial work, he was thrown in contact with men who lacked a college training, but who, through controversy and listening to every social theory, had a wider knowledge of these theories than college men.

President Hopkins called this a tragic circumstance, "in which thousands of the youth who had not gone to college had, through fuller knowledge of various contentions and longer consideration of these, acquired a lead which made the college men, who ought to have been their intellectual peers, actually inferior and weak when it came to the discussion of these questions. The college men, just out of the various institutions of learning, had no knowledge of arguments and social theories on which thousands of these boys and young men had whetted their minds for years."

L. I. D. Conference

For students interested in social and economics problems the annual League For Industrial Democracy Conference will be of interest. It will be held in New York, December 29, 30. The tentative program follows: Tuesday, Dec. 29, *The Intellectual and The Industrial Struggle*, A Symposium; *Students In Industry*, student discussion led by Professor Jerome Davis of Yale. Wednesday, Dec. 30, *Humanizing Economics*, Alvin Johnson, Director of the New School of Social Research, Robert Lee Hall and Rexford B. Tugwell of Columbia; *Economic Imperialism and Labor*, by Captain Paxton Hibben, Joseph Freeman and Paul Blanchard. Student groups interested in sending delegates and student visitors are instructed to write to The League For Industrial Democracy, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Student interest is centered on the Princeton World Court Conference, opening December 11. Over 200 colleges will have representatives at the Conference, coming from 36 states. Besides voting on the World Court issue, these delegates will be asked to vote upon the following recommendations:

First—The achievement of a spirit of unity among students of America in order to give adequate consideration to academic and collegiate questions.

Second—The formation of an intelligent and active student opinion on all questions of national importance.

Third—The promotion and fostering of understanding between the students of world as a basis for an enduring world peace.

Opening the conference, Senators Irving L. Lencort and Smith M. Brookhart will debate the World Court issue. On the following forenoon the delegates will be distributed in 10 discussion groups led by Dr. Henry Van Dyke, President Garfield of Williams, Norman Thomas, and others. Saturday afternoon there will be an Open Forum; the final meeting at which resolutions will be considered will be Saturday evening.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

California Incident Closed

Louis Russel, editor of *The Occident*, literary magazines of the University of California, refuses to resign at the request of the Associated Students and President W. Campbell. (*New Student* Dec. 3) Instead, *The Occident* will move off the campus and continue as an independent publication. The decision to sever connections with the university followed the English Club's rejection of a proposed compromise whereby the magazine would have been controlled jointly by the English Club and the Associated Students. The Club is sole owner of the magazine.

In a letter to President Campbell, Russel charges that the English club had been prevented from conducting a magazine of literature and arts because of "a total misunderstanding of the nature of the artistic enterprise by the various administrations of the University."

Furthermore, because of the part played by the administration in the publication's suppression, "it is impossible to conduct such a magazine under their direction. Consequently we wish to conduct the publication independently, so that, while it may reflect no discredit upon the University of California, it will still bring some credit to ourselves."

Meanwhile Donald C. Williams, graduate student in philosophy, whose article caused *The Occident's* suppression states his case in a letter to *The Daily Californian*:

I am here as a graduate student, a stranger this year, and it is not my place to be involved in the guerrilla warfare of undergraduate politics. . . . I incline, perhaps, to sympathize with Editor Russell's struggle, but I have harder and more thoughtful struggles of my own.

Immanuel, I may say, which has been diversely described in the papers as a "blasphemous satire" and a "reverent and beautiful poem," had for purpose to contrast the literal orthodox tradition of Israel, its impotence and anomaly, with the real beauty of the real gift of God which Mary and Joseph knew—as this contrast might have been visioned by the vigil-weary father of Jesus, who must himself have been something of a poet, a philosopher, and a seer. If the treatment seemed a little too vigorous, remember that its public would not have been cloistered and tender-souled scholastics; I had to gouge the callous spiritual cuticle of a strenuous generation.

More students are talking about the advisability of grading the professors themselves. Antioch College has a system whereby this can be done. The *Tufts Weekly* suggests this innovation. The reason is that, "at present a professor may often be more or less of a fixture around a college with nothing to check him up or make him aware of his shortcomings. The student who presumed to inform his instructor wherein he fell a bit short would fare ill. Yet few things would tend more to improve a given instructor's work or attitude toward his classes. The professor who make it a point to flunk half of his class, or who was uncivil toward students or who failed to make his subject clear would, through the proposed plan, instantly have the fact made clear to himself and to those who should know about it."

ACTIVITIES

OVERWORKED SENIORS

(Continued from page 1, col. 1)

(yearbook) The glories of a certain fraternity are substantiated by the fact that every man in its last year's senior delegation had at least an inch and a half of points beside his picture. The freshman's ideal is the man with the greatest number of points, so he determines to be a "big man around the campus." He jumps at every opportunity to annex a point. When he joins a club, he immediately annexes his *Olla Pod* point although he attends only the first meeting . . . when he becomes a senior, he is up to his neck in extra-curriculum work."

Abolition of the *Olla Podrida* point is suggested "already some of the clubs have seen the light. One has voted that membership in the club should not be recorded in the annual and that the group picture should be eliminated. Another has gone so far as to discuss suspension of activities!"

. . .

At Williams

At Williams a Committee on the Limitation of Extra-Curricular Activities studied the local scene for a month, then issued a voluminous report which has been accepted by the Student Council.

Surprisingly few men held a large majority of campus jobs; in the class of '26 less than 40% are actually engaged in these activities while 88% of the class competed for participation. As the Record interprets, "criterion of success has become—not how well a man does his job, but how many jobs a man holds."

Proposals outlined by the investigators are designed to bring about:

(1) the more even distribution of positions, (2) the participation of more men in extra-curricular activities, (3) the healthy growth of organizations under the leadership of men who are primarily interested in those organizations, (4) the participation of undergraduates in extra-curricular activities so reasonably that they will not interfere with their academic work, their reading and their social pleasures.

LETTER BOX

College Fraternities

Sirs: Often, when I have read my copy of *The New Student*, I feel inclined to write you my comments, for you are certainly a provocative crew. As a rule I'm too lazy to carry out the inclination, but here, for once, let her rip.

I think "R. J. B." is a punk reviewer, if his account of Musgrave's book on college fraternities is a fair sample of his work. He writes moderately well, if not always grammatically, but his article strikes me as extremely superficial. Poking fun at a thing, and making fun of it, are two different things. He pokes fun fairly ably at the fraternities and their members, but in such a way that only those who already think them ludicrous would enjoy it. He doesn't even attempt the much harder thing—making us perceive the ridiculousness of that which he thinks is ridiculous, and laugh at it as we would not have done without his

satire. In short, he doesn't "show" a thing; all he does is say, "Gosh, isn't this funny? Let's all laugh!" . . .

As I see it, it is largely a question of organizational size. The groups to which each of us normally belongs range in size from two members (ones self and ones best friend—or spouse) all the way up to the whole human race. Each group has its special social functions, and as a general rule each group has an intensity of group-spirit in inverse proportion to its comparative size. The college or university may, as we know, vary widely in numbers and yet be successful—from about a hundred to twenty or thirty thousand. The same general rule holds good for it—the smaller the number, the more intense the group-feeling, college spirit. And in its functions, it also varies according to size, the larger unit being able to offer, through subsidiary departments, a very much greater variety of brands of knowledge. But even at its smallest, it seems to me that the college is too large a unit to handle effectively and satisfactorily the social life of its students. A group organized for social life must be small enough so that each can know all the others well, and large enough so that he will not know them too well and be bored by them. I think that size is from twenty to forty individuals, which is the usual range of size of fraternity chapters. This number is also well adapted to cohabitational purposes. A family, with members of various sexes and ages, needs a house for only a few persons, but boys of eighteen or twenty very cheerfully can and do squeeze themselves into rabbit-warrens and thrive. I think it is better for them to organize and run their own houses than to live in college dormitories—and I have never heard of a better instrument than the fraternity to handle that problem. . . . As to regimentation, every group tends to that. . . .

An individualism too weak to withstand the rather mild pressure applied by a fraternity chapter, is hardly valuable enough to worry about. I remember, moreover, an occasion when a "good citizen" member of my chapter criticized one or two others for certain non-conformities, and the chapter head himself rose in protest to declare that that chapter's pride was in the diversity of its members, and that the more dissimilar they were, the better he liked it. . . .

. . . I close. But not without expressing my general admiration for your paper and most of its objects, and my hope that you will grow better, merrier and fiercer with the years.

Cordially,
John M. Price

New York

Student competition for jobs is keen in the vicinity of large universities. But Victor I. Eagan an ingenious medical student at the University of Minnesota has found work at a place where few of his classmates will follow. He pays his tuition in the medical school by parachute jumping.

. . .

Stanford University has adopted an independent Study Plan whereby students with a grade of B or over will be released from class attendance. Students will enroll at the beginning of the junior year and will pursue their work under the supervision of a special advisor. At the end of the senior year there is a comprehensive examination covering the two year's work.

SPORTS

FOOTBALL OVEREMPHASIS

(Continued from Page 1, Column 3)

between colleges and foster unity within institutions. But one sport, football, has taken such a hold on undergraduates, alumni and the public that its importance over the courses of the playing season looms larger than any other aspect of the college, especially over the primary aspect—intellectual thinking.

"We believe that this situation would be obviated largely by the colleges scheduling only four games each season, each game with a team in its own class and in its own vicinity.

"The reasons which lead us to this conclusion are:

1. Schedules of only four games would render impossible the present annual elimination contests among the teams of the country, and consequently would render impossible the choice of mythical national and even sectional champions. Many teams would remain undefeated instead of a few.

2. With this aspect removed, less publicity would be given the game by the press and the public imagination would not be whetted so that the fever of interest would be forced up within undergraduate bodies.

3. The necessity for spring and early season training would be done away with, since the four games would be played on successive week-ends beginning late in October. Practice, as at present, could start two or three weeks before the first game.

4. The crescendo of interest, at present, extending over eight games, would be limited to four games; and so the large percentage of attention given football now would be lessened by the cutting down of the length of the season.

5. Colleges playing teams only in their own class and vicinity would minimize the commercial aspect of schedule making; and no small college teams would be called upon to sacrifice themselves in order to make money for their institutions—as at present. This altruistic motive given for these set-up games, the making of money to support other sports, is in no sense a defense for football. Appropriate taxes on undergraduates would serve instead, if such a step were necessary.

We would also inaugurate the following rules within the colleges:

1. That graduate coaching systems be instituted, and that no coach be paid a salary beyond that of a professor; and

2. That coaches be not allowed to sit on the players' bench during the game, but that captains alone direct their teams so that undergraduates would be playing undergraduates and not coaches playing coaches.

The resolution was drawn up by E. J. Duffy, editor-in-chief of *The Dartmouth* and a member of the championship Dartmouth football team. It will immediately be sent to college presidents throughout the country. The association of twelve New England Colleges will hear a report of it at the next conference.

Enthusiasm was voiced by delegates from nine colleges—Dartmouth, Harvard, Tufts, Trinity, Bowdoin, Williams, Connecticut Agricultural College, Wesleyan, Princeton. The delegates were editors of student papers, student government officials. While their action does not commit student bodies represented to any policy, as college leaders they can do much to influence student opinion.

Discussion of intercollegiate football will not hesitate at this point. The Eastern Inter-collegiate Debate League, composed of nine colleges, will take up the subject. The Harvard Debating Union recently questioned the over emphasis of football. By a vote of 215 to 209 it decided that the game was getting undue emphasis.

R. O. T. C. - In Many Colleges

Campaign On Against Military In Schools and Colleges

A pamphlet by Winthrop D. Lane attacking military training in high schools and colleges has been issued by the Committee on Military Training, 387 Bible House, New York City. A foreword to the pamphlet is signed by 58 prominent men and women, including President Henry W. MacCracken of Vassar, Hon. Wm. E. Borah, Jane Addams, Professor George A. Coe, John Dewey, Robert M. LaFollette Jr. and Zona Gale.

The forward is a call for action against military training in the schools. "Even those who, having read the pamphlet, still believe in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, will surely want to be on their guard against its becoming a means of militarizing America. It would be a tragedy if at the very moment when such ancient enemies as France and Germany are outlawing war between each other the military spirit should assert itself in the United States.

"Our schools ought to be the best defense against this. There certainly we should have a positive education for peace. Such education for peace. Such education is wholly inconsistent (1) with military training in the high schools and (2) with compulsory military courses in the colleges.

"At the very least, military training should be rigidly excluded from the high schools. It does not provide the best form of physical training, it does not teach constructive citizenship; if successful it tends to impart aggressive, even jingoistic, notions by its effect upon immature minds at their formative period.

"When such training is made compulsory in high schools it is an indirect approach to that universal military training and service which in peaceful time public opinion in America has overwhelmingly rejected.

"The removal of military training from high schools and of its compulsory features from the colleges is a minimum program for dealing with R. O. T. C. But a further conclusion is forced upon us. We are convinced that it is alien to the best interests of our universities and to the highest ideals of learning that the War Department should be given so much power and military training so much place as it now has in our college world.

"The atmosphere of military training is not the atmosphere for the finest, the most thoughtful work along any line requiring independent thinking. Higher education ought to exist for the encouragement of independent thinking.

At Ohio State

While a faculty committee ponders the educational value of military training, Ohio State University students wrangle. Defenders of compulsory drill call their opponents "Bolshevists and Reds." Letters pro and con appear in the *Lantern*. Editor Joseph M. Ripley '26, an ex-service man, hammers away at the "conscript army in time of peace." He printed the whole of Captain Shipp's defense of the R. O. T. C. before the Liberal Club, declaring that said speech constitutes an "excellent argument against the system."

One student correspondent waxes facetious over the educational value of drill:

"There was one bit of educational value given me by a drill sergeant who has seen the world from the hold of a battleship. He told me and the rest of the class that no ladies are allowed to visit the ruins of Pompeii for reasons which he related with gusto and which you, Mr. Editor, cannot be told.

"Another sergeant taught me the trick of chewing an overly large cud of tobacco and giving commands at the same time. While I consider this of great value, I have not as yet had occasion to put the knowledge to practical use. . . ."

University of Oregon

Editorial reflection, from the University of Oregon *Emerald*:

"It will be recalled that four years ago the Oregon students, led by the *Emerald*, declared war on war in much the same manner as the New York students are doing today. Although military training is still here today, many Oregon students will rejoice in the New York revolt. Military training in Oregon today is justified possibly in theory but in practical results it must be confessed that the burden of proof remains with the military advocates. The men do not show the results of discipline, physical improvement or mental proficiency, and, judging from appearances, for the most part the University of Oregon army would be only at home in Napoleon's grand flight from Russia."

New York City College

The Lavender, literary magazine of New York City College, in a R. O. T. C. number, rises to protest against the presidential injunction forbidding the mention of the military training controversy in *The Campus*, student newspaper. Before protesting *The Lavender* states that heretofore the two student periodicals have never felt the cramp of censorship. "The present censorship will go far toward destroying the confidence of the students in the college authorities. . . ."

Faculty members deserted the students at the crucial test, *The Lavender* asserts. The majority of them met the student protest against compulsory training with silence. "With rare exception they refused publicity to express their opinions—even after having forcibly expressed them in private."

Other recent developments:

■ The pamphlet on military training by Winthrop B. Lane was put on sale at the college, but the sale was stopped by Dean Brownson, on the ground that his permission had not been obtained.

■ Two referendums are being taken; one of the faculty, another of the students' parents. The latter because of the statement by Dr. Mezes that the student opinion was immature.

Amherst College

The Connecticut Valley Collegiate World Court Conference, meeting at Amherst, on Dec. 6, endorsed America's entry into the World Court and also adopted the following resolution:

"That this group ask our colleges to ask the whole American student body to re-

quest of Congress at least as much as it spent on the R. O. T. C. for interchange of students and at the same time through our own efforts advance the same thing."

Stanford University

At Stanford University, where the R. O. T. C. is voluntary, military drill is becoming a popular subject. The enrollment increased from 153 students in 1923 to the present enrollment of 326.

CLASSROOMS

UNDERGRADUATE PARLEY

(Continued from Page 1, Col. 2)

ing whether scholarship as a whole is serving our life as a whole."

Followed two days of formal sessions, intimate groups double banked about fraternity fireplaces, succeeded by more intimate bull sessions in private rooms. There was the impact of idea after idea, almost dizzying the undergraduate minds. In addition to Dr. Meiklejohn, the speakers were Dr. Frank Goodnow of Johns Hopkins, James Harvey Robinson and Dr. Ben D. Wood of Columbia University. All the speakers remained during the parley. Dr. Goodnow, from the audience, challenging Dr. Meiklejohn's curriculum. Dr. Meiklejohn carefully restraining a desire to shout his disapproval of the educational program which Dr. Goodnow outlined for the Johns Hopkins of the future.

Dr. Goodnow described the change of the American college from an institute for imparting liberal culture to a "preparatory school for the professions." At the same time there has been a tendency for the last two years of preparatory school to overlap the first two of college. The New Johns Hopkins will extend university methods to the last two years of college work. "A university cannot successfully devote itself at the same time to secondary and advanced instructions. Under the present system the use of secondary methods is unduly prolonged and the use of methods best suited to advanced work is postponed."

On Saturday James Harvey Robinson, genial skeptic discussed the question of "How We Think." Merrily he overturned the framework of dogma that pedants have reared over learning: the conception that learning is something that may be imposed by rules and regulations.

At other session Dr. Ben D. Wood discussed the new type of objective standardized examinations now being introduced in many institutions.

Need Extra
Christmas
Money?

You can have it!

Write for Agents terms to

The New Student
2929 Broadway, New York City.

KNOCKS-From the College Press

"One reads it for its very Bunk"

(From *The Athenaeum**)

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps may have to call all its scientific knowledge of defense to aid in routing the opposing forces of "individuality" which is threatening to sweep the colleges of the nation where military training is made compulsory.

The New Student, which "invites the student to participate in his own education," is also subtly inviting college men of America to rebel against their government in the first adequate plan of preparedness that the nation has ever sponsored.

The New Student, published in New York City, makes it a rule to merely quote from college papers editorials, but it is rather obvious that only startling and fanatical comment is clipped. . . .

Because the C. C. N. Y. boys didn't want to pack a rifle *The New Student* wrote in their headlines the following unnewspaper-like title: "Thumbs Down, R. O. T. C. Is Unpopular" and went on with a lengthy dissertation regarding the atrociousness of military training.

Compulsory military training is probably not theoretically correct in that it does not allow the student to take what he wants (and *The New Student* stresses individuality) but if America wants protection through a reserve corps, compulsion is necessary. The average college freshman thinks only of himself. . . . Consequently, if he were not forced to take military, his indolent attitude would prevent his doing the very thing that he would have wished he did 19 years later. . . .

America had 45,000 troops when the World war began. Had Germany, with her immense army, come directly to this country, dire disaster would have resulted. Germany may be weakened but Japan and China have millions and millions. Possibly *The New Student* would prevent the fire, murder and rape of an onswearing army merely giving away free issues of *The New Student* to the aggressors. And, above all, *The New Student* forgets that "goose-stepping" to a certain degree promotes individuality in later years. Do we realize that too much "goose-stepping" in inadvisable only after we have "goose-stepped?"

The magazine has built up a clever protection for itself. Any who decries its motives are branded as sheep and two cowardly to act as *The New Student* advises. And the magazine is a forceful one; one reads it for its very bunk and many gullible ones believe it as they did the writings of Horace Greeley and the speeches of Mr. Bryan.

Ohio State is thinking of voting on the question. . . . Other western universities are considering the matter seriously, and it is the outgrowth of one man's opinion, amplified through the distorting *New Student* loud speaker.

And, is it not more than probably that this one man's opinion is the result of the fact that he deliberately planned to act differently from his cohorts and then to brand them "goose-steppers" if they disagreed? Of course, we're all goose-steppers, but no more so than the 2,092 out of 3,300

C. C. N. Y. college students who followed the leader and vote against compulsory military training the other day.

Merely Laziness

(From the *Purdue Exponent*)

A certain "modern" student magazine, purporting to interpret the thought of American campuses, but in reality quoting only such thoughts as agree with their unstated but easily observable editorial policy, waxes quite enthusiastic over the fact that the College of the City of New York voted overwhelmingly to abolish compulsory R. O. T. C. It brands as "illconsidered abuse" the statement of an army officer that: "every student at City College who voted to abolish military training is a potential traitor." Without comment it publishes the statement of the president of the college that, "The boys are acting the way boys usually act. They are trying to avoid having to take a course that requires two hours a week inconvenient attendance. To construe this as having anything relating to pacifism or militaryism is unwarranted."

The president undoubtedly was right. . . . The present type of collegian seems willing to take active steps to do away with anything which may detract a little from his comfort. At Ohio State in a similar controversy, the editor followed his campaign with an editorial which adequately expressed our thought. "We like those compliments," he writes, referring to letters he had received, "but we are beginning to wonder if they were sent because the student readers approve of the principles advanced or because the students see that . . . they will be relieved of some personal inconvenience. We wonder, for example, if the student readers agree with us on the principle of military training—which thing alone concerns us—or . . . because blue uniforms are hot these days."

No, we do not think the New York vote indicates a sweeping victory for pacifism. . . . The New York students are not to be condemned particularly for their actions. . . . But we do think that the agitators of the movement merit the criticism which was directed against the students by authorities. . . .

"Much Ado About Trifles"

(From *Vermont Cynic*)

Opposition to compulsory military training is creating a considerable furore at C. C. N. Y. At a mass meeting silent prayer was offered for "those who were murdered, butchered and slaughtered in the last war." The purpose of its wording is clear—also the reason why the *New Student* features it.

If we understand rightly, the *New Student* objects to compulsory military training because it is training you to kill; it appears at other times to object to compulsory chapel because—why? Perhaps "compulsory" explains all. In other words, let the dear things work out their own salvation.

Meanwhile President Mezes is quoted as saying that "they are trying to avoid having to take a course that requires two hours a week inconvenient attendance." Which, it must be admitted, savors more of the probable truth than the veiled inferences of

the *New Student* that this and similar incidents result from conscientious objection to the training.

Last year a big fuss was made over the R. O. T. C. number of the *B. U. Beanpot*, and after reading the *New Student* we supposed the whole university was up in arms, and Dean Lord was the most unpopular man in Boston, not excluding Beacon Hill's opinion of Curly.

After a visit at B. U., however, we were convinced that seven out of ten weren't interested, two thought the training a good thing, and the others were making a noise. Which may be the case at C. C. N. Y., Missouri, and on other campuses.

Shakespeare would describe the situation in four words—"much ado about nothing."

Be Kind to Your Professor

(From *The Ozanam**)

The New Student is one of the breeziest of the youthful publications that find their way to our sanctum. It is a digest of the things that happen at the colleges and universities throughout the country. It is anything but old-fashioned and conservative. Nor is its criticism timid. It is to be congratulated for the large amount of interest that it succeeds in packing in its four pages.

Interest, however, is not a claim to unqualified approval. Among the themes that occupy a great deal of the *New Student's* attention is, in general, what we may call bossing the college. This may be putting it a bit bluntly, but in the last analysis that is just about what it amounts to.

Now, for our part, we must admit that we should not be averse to having a voice in dictating the way our school should be run. Mind, we do not claim for ourselves any breadth of knowledge or depth of view that would enable us to run it better than it is now being run. But we feel that all too often our likes and dislikes are not consulted to the extent that we should like. We are conscious, of course, that those likes and dislikes, if catered to, would not be the most beneficial thing for us. That's where the rub comes in. It's a strong-willed doctor that will prescribe bitter medicine for himself. And it's a fortunate patient that has a doctor who is not too tender-hearted to give him the medicine he needs.

It is not surprising, then, that there is much moaning in the *New Student* concerning the way the colleges and universities are run. . . . But there is such a thing as going too far. To hold professors up to public ridicule because of the way they conduct their courses, as was done not long ago by the *Harvard Crimson*, is not liable to make for that harmony . . . between professor and student. To take the attitude that there is an essential opposition between the students' interests and those of the professor, or to imply that there is a necessary antagonism between the two groups, or that the faculty is a crowd of fogies and that the student body could set them all right if they could only get the chance; all this is to tear down rather than to build up.

Of course we recognize that there is such a thing as honest criticism. But it has its method and its manner. For safety's sake it would not at all be a bad idea to go on the assumption that the major portion of wisdom is on the side of the faculty, until such time as the student has fairly convincing proof that such is not the case.

J. C.

*West Virginia University.

*St. John's College, Toledo, Ohio.